

Running head: SOCIAL JUSTICE CURRICULUM

A Critical Analysis of Literature on Social Justice Curriculum:

Avoiding Historical Amnesia

Nicholas Daniel Hartlep¹, M.S.Ed.

University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee

Publication Date: May 16, 2009

¹ Nicholas Daniel Hartlep is a Ph.D. student at the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, where he is pursuing a degree in Urban Education and Social Foundations of Education. His research focuses on Critical Race Theory (CRT) as it relates to race, equity, and the improvement of education, especially at the PK-12 level. Hartlep is an active member of AERA, currently serving as an AERA campus liaison and Division K Junior Representative. He is a member of Division J, Postsecondary Education, Division K, Teaching and Teacher Education, a member of the Urban Learning, Teaching and Research SIG, and a member of the Hispanic Research Issues SIG. Hartlep is a teacher in the Milwaukee Public Schools, the largest school district in the state of Wisconsin. Hartlep holds two degrees in education: a B.S. degree in teaching and an M.S.Ed. in K-12 education. **Author's Note:** Address all correspondence to Nicholas Daniel Hartlep, A.O.P. Fellow, now at the Urban Education Doctoral Program, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee, WI 53201.

Abstract

The purpose of this critical analysis is to gain quantitatively greater statistical accuracy synthesizing past empirical studies conducted on the topic of social justice curriculum (hereafter SJC) with similar research foci, but dissimilar research questions. Currently there is a clarion call for further quantitative research to be conducted on the topic of SJC. According to Matsumoto (1994) quantitative educational research typically adheres to one of the following two paradigms: (1) universalistic (etic) view, or (2) relativistic (emic) view. Three studies were critically analyzed. Sample sizes varied between the studies from as small as $n = 12$ to as large as $n = 55$. Only one study provided sufficient data/information needed to calculate effect size and thus, was the only study statistically analyzed in this critique. Given the conclusory findings of this critical analysis, current understandings have been promoted. It appears that an effective SJC should consist of, but should not and cannot be limited to the following elements: (1) the preparation for college, (2) the questioning of current educational practices, (3) the unlearning of “common sense beliefs,” (4) the teaching of racial consciousness, (5) the teaching of multicultural awareness, (6) being delivered in such a way that the teacher and students are of equal status, and (7) the valuing of cooperation and collaboration.

A Critical Analysis of Literature on Social Justice Curriculum: Avoiding Historical Amnesia

The purpose of this critical analysis is to gain quantitatively greater statistical accuracy synthesizing past empirical studies conducted on the topic of social justice curriculum (hereafter SJC) with similar research foci, but dissimilar research questions. Currently there is a clarion call for further quantitative research to be conducted on the topic of SJC. According to Matsumoto (1994) quantitative educational research typically adheres to one of the following two paradigms: (1) universalistic (etic) view, or (2) relativistic (emic) view.

The universalistic, or etic view considers research study findings to be truths that can be extended across *all* cultural groups or people; whereas, the relativistic, or emic view considers research study findings to reveal only particular truths which are confined to a single culture, social group, or people. Educational researchers traditionally have used universalistic frameworks and paradigms (e.g., Banks, 1993; Kerlinger, 1979) when fulfilling their research.

The proliferation of the universalistic or etic paradigm is problematic for education. It is problematic because this paradigm is culturally insensitive, since it is highly Eurocentric—being monolingual and male-oriented. It also typically views low-income students and students of color from a deficit point of view. It is essential for the improvement of education to have more “gold-standard” quantitative studies because they provide statistical insights that qualitative studies cannot, as well as because they are in short supply.

An additional problem when attempting to understand social justice is that the nomenclature of SJC elicits different definitions for different people—both laypeople and those within the academy—which is apparent when reviewing the current literature. Boyles, Carusi, and Attick (as cited in Ayers, Quinn, & Stovall, 2009) indicate, “Discerning the meaning of social justice is challenging because [of] its disparate uses across diverse viewpoints” (p. 37). Saltman (as cited in Ayers, et. al., 2009) similarly states, “[...] social justice does not have a unified or static meaning [...]” (p. 1). According to Nieto (2006), “Along with my colleague Patty Bode, I define social justice as both *a philosophy and actions that embody treating all people with fairness, respect, dignity, and generosity*” (p. 5 [her emphasis]).

There is a need to regain clarity of what SJC is due to the enormity and vastness of its numerous and broad definitions, as well as due to the lack of quantitative/empirical studies on this topic. Many extraneous curricula are miscategorized under the banner of SJC. An example of this tempering is interpreting SJC to be equivalent to *diversity*. Another common misconception is the conflation of SJC with “distributive justice” (e.g., Young, 1990; Finn, 1993; Hirsch et al., 1988). This conflation blurs and threatens SJC as a curriculum by tempering SJC’s charge: to forge a democratic education for *real* social change (Ayers, et. al., 2009).

Ayers (2009) further explicates social justice’s charge:

1) *Equity*, the principle of fairness, equal access to the most challenging and nourishing educational experiences, the demand that what the most privileged and enlightened are able to provide their children must be the standard for what is made available to all children. This must also account for injustices. 2) *Activism*, the principle of agency, full participation, preparing youngsters to see and understand and, when necessary, to challenge all that is before them. This is a move away from passivity, cynicism, and despair. 3) *Social literacy*, the principle of

relevance, resisting the flattening effects of materialism and consumerism and the power of the abiding social evils of white supremacy, patriarchy, homophobia—nourishing awareness of our own identities and our connection with others, reminding us of the powerful commitment, persistence, bravery, and triumphs of our justice-seeking forebears, reminding us as well of the link between ideas and the concentric circles of context—economic condition, historical flow, cultural surround—within which our lives are negotiated. (p. xiv)

The literature on SJC is fractured and there is no generally agreed-upon definition of what social justice is within or outside the academy. According to Posner (2004), “No school curriculum can address all the needs of every American social or ethnic group” (p. 209). If Posner’s assertion is accurate, a critical analysis is merited, one that critically analyzes why this is true. Is a curriculum unable to meet the needs of every American social or ethnic group because it serves a hidden purpose? Is SJC capable of meeting the needs of *every* social or ethnic group?

Currently there exists a multitude of studies conducted on the topic of SJC; however, the great majority of these studies are approached qualitatively (e.g., Stovall 2009a, 2009b; Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Lindlof & Taylor, 2002; Levstik & Tyson, 2008; Guba, 1990). There is a shortage of empirical studies that research SJC quantitatively. This critical analysis aims to accomplish the following:

- (1) determine the common elements of a high school social justice curriculum, and
- (2) reconceptualize existing conceptualizations and paradigms of SJC to better articulate the goals and outcomes of the curricula.

Methodology and Parameters

Research Question

The overarching question for this critical analysis is, “What are common elements of a high school social justice curriculum?” At the time of this study (spring 2009), the articles contained in this critical analysis were obtained from a search of literature utilizing the Education database SAGE². The following limiters, Boolean operators, truncation operators, and search criteria were used:

- (a) “high school” or “secondary”,
- (b) and (“social justice” and (curricula* or program)),
- (c) and “critical pedagogy”,
- (d) (peer reviewed) journal articles,
- (e) and were published between 2008 and 2009.

By using the * (asterisk) truncation operator, more hits were presumed to be obtained, since curricula* retrieves entries for *all* articles containing the words “curriculum” or “curricula.” As a result, 25 articles were found; after removing duplicate articles, there were 20 articles. Parameters were then needed to narrowly define articles of interest for this critical analysis. Articles were only selected that:

- (a) either used an experimental,
- (b) quasi-experimental,
- (c) pretest-posttest, and/or
- (d) a prequestionnaire-post questionnaire design.

² **CAVEAT:** The SAGE Database was used instead of the commonly used ERIC Database since it provided *only* full-text of 26 peer-reviewed journals published by SAGE. ERIC was initially searched; however, it did not produce as strenuous a search as SAGE.

Table 1 illustrates that as a result of this paring down, three articles were found—two empirical in nature, and one qualitative in nature—that met all of the aforementioned criteria for this critical analysis. Sample sizes varied between the studies from as small as $n = 12$ to as large as $n = 55$. Only one study provided sufficient data/information needed to calculate effect size (hereafter ES) and thus, was the only study quantitatively analyzed in this critique.

Table 1

Three High School Social Justice Curriculum Studies

Topic Area	Research Study	Technique	Intervention or Program	Conclusions
Critical Language Pedagogy ($n = 55$)	Case Narrative	Pre- and Postquestionnaires	Weeklong unit	Godley and Minnici (1998) found that language variety and <i>code-switching</i> are desirable elements of high school curriculum insofar as they help address how dominant culture and groups subordinate others (such as through the use of the language of power).
Racism Awareness ($n = 74$)	Case Narrative	Pre- and Posttests	YES! Program	Thomas, Davidson, and Mcadoo (2008) found that high school curriculum that focuses on African American historical and contemporary experiences with racism is effective in building community, growing a positive individual's ethnic identity, and increasing youth participation in liberatory activism.
Antiracism Education ($n = 12$)	Longitudinal Study	Pre- and Posttests	<i>Bridge Builders Academic Mentoring Program (BAMP)</i>	Kerssen-Griep and Eifler (2008) found that by enhancing one's intercultural communication (through transformative education), one's consciousness of racism is elevated.

Data Collection Methods

In order to explain and to gain greater clarity of the effect of the *Bridge Builders Academic Mentoring Program (BAMP)* used in Kerssen-Griep and Eifler's (2008) study, quantitative analyses and calculations were used to compute ES's for each facet of

Communication Competence. The statistical procedure used with the selected study was Cohen's d for effect size (ES) measures for repeated-measures.

Results and Analysis

Table 2 illustrates the individualized ES's for Kerssen-Griep and Eifler's study, *When Cross-Racial Contact Transforms Intercultural Communication Competence*. ES's were initially calculated utilizing freeware³ electronic software; however, they were also hand-calculated in order to ensure accuracy (see Appendix A).

Discussion of Other Articles

Thomas, Davidson, and Mcadoo's (2008) study, *An Evaluation Study of the Young Empowered Sisters (YES!) Program* focused on antiracist education practices. It was one of three articles (studies) that were selected after meeting search criteria and relevance. Thomas et al. did not present the summary data necessary to calculate an ES for the ANCOVA tests incorporated; therefore, a Cohen's d was unable to be derived.

In Godley and Minnici's (1998) study, *Critical Language Pedagogy*, teachers focused on language and the ability to *code-switch*⁴. It was one of three articles (studies) that were selected after meeting search criteria and relevance. A Cohen's d was unable to be derived in Godley and Minnici's study because the pre- and post-questionnaires relied upon qualitative—not quantitative—data. Nonetheless, Godley and Minnici reported the following:

[...] student questionnaires indicated that the implementation of critical language pedagogy in our language variation unit led students to more positive, detailed, and reflective understandings of their own dialect use that were maintained over time. Students' written reflections on the unit also suggested that they had learned to question widespread language ideologies, particularly the assumption that some dialects are better than

³ Effect Size (ES) calculated using freeware; access at: <http://www.danielsoper.com/statcalc/calc48.aspx>

⁴ For further explanation of *code-switching*, see (Delpit, 1995; 2002)

others. For example, in response to the question, “What was the most interesting or useful idea or skill you learned during our unit?” one student wrote, “There’s really no correct English; every English dialect is all English.” Another student wrote, “People do a lot of stereotyping.” (p. 338)

Even though the two aforementioned studies were not quantitatively analyzed through ES analyses, they are both important in this critical analysis because they both speak to two major elements that recurrently appear in SJC: (1) antiracism education (e.g., May, 1999) and/or racial awareness/consciousness (e.g., Milroy, 2001), and (2) being critical and questioning current practices—status-quo dogma (e.g., Ball 2000).

Formulae/ES Calculations

Kerssen-Griep and Eifler’s (2008) study reported repeated-measures *t*-test statistics for each individual component of the overall BASIC score. Therefore, the calculations used to determine ES’s were as follows:

A *t* value was inputted into the following formula: $t = \frac{(\bar{D})}{S_{\bar{D}}}$, where \bar{D} is the mean

difference (posttest minus pretest), and $S_{\bar{D}}$ is the standard deviation score for this particular mean difference score. Once the standard deviation of the mean difference $S_{\bar{D}}$

was calculated, it was inputted into the following formula: $S_{\bar{D}} = \frac{S}{\sqrt{n}}$, where *n* is the

sample size (in this case, *n* = 12), and *S* is the standard deviation. The standard

deviation, *S*, was then inputted into the following equation: $d = \frac{(\bar{D})}{S}$, where *d* is the

estimated Cohen’s *d* (ES), and \bar{D} is the mean difference (posttest minus pretest). This last and final calculation gave the ability to calculate the ES (Cohen’s *d* for repeated-measures *t*-tests).

Interpretation

Lipsey (2001) states the following about meta-analysis:

The set of findings included in a meta-analysis must result from comparable research designs for practical reasons as well as conceptual ones. Meta-analysis represents each study's findings in the form of *effect sizes*. An effect size is a statistic that encodes the critical quantitative information from each relevant study finding. (p. 3)

ES measures are the common currency of meta-analysis studies; however, in the current corpus of literature on SJC, there is an enormous lack of statistical or quantifiable information. Therefore, there are currently not enough experimental and/or quasi-experimental studies conducted on SJC in order that meta-analyses may be completed.

The calculated ES's of Kerssen-Griep and Eifler's (2008) study provide numerical data for arguing what the important elements of a high school SJC are. ES's are generally interpreted (see Appendix B) as follows: (1) Large effects are classified as $d \geq 0.8$, (2) Medium effects are classified as $0.5 \leq d \leq 0.7$, and (3) Small effects are classified as $d \leq 0.4$.

The ES's presented in Table 2. illustrate the large effect the following communication competences played in this study: (1) Respond descriptively, (2) Display empathy, (3) Express respect and positive regard, (4) Ambiguity tolerance, and (5) Interaction management. If a communication competence had a large effect, we can interpret it to mean that it had a large effect in this study.

Table 2

Bridge Builders Academic Mentoring Program (BAMP)

Communication Competence Dimensions (<i>n</i> =2)	<u>October</u>		<u>April</u>		<i>t</i>	Effect Size (Cohen's <i>d</i>)
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Summed BASIC Score	30.30	2.06	35.20	3.05	5.50***	1.5877
1. <i>Respond descriptively</i>	3.13	.30	3.90	.28	7.99***	2.3065
2. <i>Display empathy</i>	3.63	.61	4.53	.61	6.08***	1.7551
3. <i>Express respect and positive regard</i>	4.20	.65	5.00	.00	4.77***	1.3769
4. Ambiguity tolerance	4.13	.61	4.77	.42	3.54**	1.0219
5. Interaction management	4.00	.53	4.60	.60	2.97*	0.8573
6. Group maintenance behaviors	3.93	.46	4.40	.71	1.93	0.5571
7. Group task role behaviors	3.87	.52	4.30	.70	1.75	0.5051
8. Personal knowledge orientation	3.40	.60	3.70	.46	1.66	0.4792

Note. Range of possible scores was 1-5 for all scale items except numbers 1 and 8 above, which ranged from 1 to 4. Italicized dimensions' changes are significant at the Bonferroni-corrected $p < .006$ level. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

After critical analyses (see Appendix C), it appears that an effective SJC may consist of, but should not be limited to the following elements: (1) the preparation for college, (2) the questioning of current educational practices, (3) the unlearning of “common sense beliefs,” (4) the teaching of racial consciousness, (5) the teaching of multicultural awareness, (6) being delivered in such a way that the teacher and students are of equal status, and (7) the valuing of cooperation and collaboration.

College Preparation

Few will argue the importance of a college degree (4-year or 2-year) in the 21st-century. However, Oakes, Joseph, and Muir (as cited in Banks & McGee Banks, 2004) indicate that “currently the structures in place do not allow participation and high achievement possible for low-income students of color” (p. 87). Oakes et al. (as cited in Banks & McGee Banks, 2004) further this notion by stating the following:

A college-going culture at school, high-quality curriculum, well-prepared and knowledgeable teachers, special academic assistance when needed, supportive relationships with caring school adults, and connections with families focused on high achievement and college going all seem to foster the outcomes we seek for low-income students and students of color. (p. 87 [author’s emphasis])

The current literature is quite clear regarding the importance of rigorous coursework in high school, as well as its effects in shaping, creating, and enhancing college competencies—all yielding a higher likelihood of future collegiate success. The cumulative effects of rigorous middle and high school math and science courses are particularly strong for low-income students. According to Adelman (as cited in Ayers et al., 2009), “As with Algebra II, advanced placement course taking strongly correlates with completion of a bachelor’s degree. Even more so than to college access” (p. 82). College preparation appears to find alignment within the aforesaid structural aims and goals of SJC.

Questioning of Current Educational Practices

SJC may be perceived by the majority (status-quo) as a “radical” and “non-traditional” curriculum since it is christened to question current educational practices⁵. Bowles and Gintis (1976) and Willis (1977) posit:

⁵ Current educational practices tend to be Eurocentric in nature.

Much schooling has been a training ground for workers for a capitalist economy, social justice curriculum must be wary not to simply become a training ground for the rank and file in a political cause. (as cited in Ayers, et. al., 2009, p. 462)

SJC questions current educational practices since school curriculum is designed to maintain the current social order (e.g., Swartz, 1992; Ladson-Billings, 1994, 1995, 1998).

Ladson-Billings (as cited in Banks & McGee Banks, 2004) posits:

[...] master scripting means stories of people of color, women, and anyone who challenges this script is muted and erased...Examples of this muting and erasure are evident in the way cultural heroes are transformed in textbooks to make them more palatable to dominant constituencies. (p. 58)

Master scripting is something SJC attempts to dismantle through the questioning of current educational practices as well as through social just teaching.

Unlearning of Common Sense Beliefs

Part of unlearning common sense beliefs is first grappling with the unfortunate fact that some of the stories that are commonly thought to be “true” are, unfortunately, intentionally and inaccurately told in order to marginalize and oppress certain groups of people. SJC assists in the unlearning of common sense beliefs through the concept of “storytelling” and “counter-storytelling.” This dichotomy is predicated upon the belief that schools are neutral spaces that treat everyone justly; however, close examination refutes this.

SJC works in concert with Bell’s (1980) theory of *interest convergence* to tease apart how common sense beliefs are formulated by the majority (group) to oppress the minority (group). Stated differently, interest convergence is the thought that white supremacists will support racial justice only to the extent that there is something positive in it for them, or a “convergence” between the interests of white supremacists and racial

justice. SJC attempts to inform the public how certain stories serve to silence and distort certain enclaves of people and cultures, while building up others, typically the majority (status quo).

Racial and Social Consciousness

In *Teaching for Social Justice*, Hunt (1998) articulates her thoughts on the importance of being conscious of race and social standing in a broad context. She states the following:

Teaching for social justice is at the core of democratic education....[O]ur students benefit from the rich history of people who didn't settle for the way things are: Fannie Lou Hamer, Jane Addams, Myles Horton, Chico Mendes, and numerous others—as well as lesser-known heroes such as the Tuskegee Airmen; the Navajo Code Talkers; suffragettes; and countless union workers, teachers, and good neighbors. (preface)

Racial and social class consciousnesses are interlinked. They appear to be interwoven and inseparable. Much literature has stated how mainstream rhetoric uses “color-blindness” in order to camouflage white supremacists serving their own self-interests (e.g., Tate, 1997; Dixson & Rousseau, 2005; Yosso, 2005).

Multicultural Awareness

SJC will continue to remain inert without socially just educators/facilitators. Nieto (2000) delineates how becoming a multicultural teacher requires one to first become a multicultural person. This requires learning more about multiculturalism through engaging in pluralistic activities. There is also a requirement for teachers to engage in self-introspection in regards to their own racism, biases, and prejudices (for a detailed explanation see Nieto, 2000, p. 335-344).

Equal Status Amongst Teacher and Students

SJC is inclusive; meaning, the teacher is not the possessor of wisdom, nor students merely recipients (e.g., Freire, 2001a, 2001b; Tompkins, 1990). The “banking method”

approach that Freire (2001b) identified continues to plague education and infiltrates schools nationwide. Tompkins' (1990) teacherly ethos is similar to Freire's, in that she speaks of the need of intentionally challenging the traditional classroom hierarchy in order to build a community of learning in which the teacher is a facilitator of the process of learning, not just an authority delivering knowledge; this is inter/related to what she outlines as "pedagogy of the distressed." Tompkins' teacherly ethos pivots from Freire's notion of "reciprocal learning" quite well. Reciprocal learning is best encapsulated in *Pedagogy of Freedom*, when Freire (2001a) posits:

I believe that I can state without equivocation, at this moment, that all educational practice requires the existence of "subjects," who while teaching, learn. And who in learning also teach. The reciprocal learning between teachers and students is what gives educational practice its *gnostic* [author's emphasis] character. (p. 67)

SJC flees from teacher-centered paradigms. It is this breaking-away from the status-quo that is one of many qualities that is distinctive to SJC.

Valuing Cooperation and Collaboration

SJC views cooperation and collaboration positively. According to Hidalgo, Siu, and Epstein (as cited in Ayers et al., 2009), "Puerto Rican parents value interdependence and nurture *cooperation* [author's emphasis] in children" (p. 637). Hidalgo et al. (2009) also state that interdependence among family members is expected and provides a support system for all individuals. This is corroborated by a myriad of other studies and researchers (e.g., Mizio, 1974; Salgado, 1985; Hidalgo, 1994).

Discussion

While initially attempting to perform a meta-analysis, the lack of empirical studies on SJC with similar research questions unfortunately forced this study to manifest itself in a

critical analysis. This shortage implores researchers and academics to research SJC through empirical studies and lenses. This thought is corroborated well with what many authorities in the academy have stated (e.g., Stovall 2009a, 2009b; Levstik & Tyson, 2008; Guba, 1990).

Given the conclusory findings of this critical analysis, current understandings have been promoted. It appears that an effective SJC should consist of, but should not and cannot be limited to the following elements: (1) the preparation for college, (2) the questioning of current educational practices, (3) the unlearning of “common sense beliefs,” (4) the teaching of racial consciousness, (5) the teaching of multicultural awareness, (6) being delivered in such a way that the teacher and students are of equal status, and (7) the valuing of cooperation and collaboration. Who will be the vanguards of these much-needed quantitative studies?

References

- Ayers, W., Hunt, J. A., & Quinn, T. (1998). *Teaching for Social Justice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Ayers, W., Quinn, T., & Stovall, D. (2009). *Handbook of Social Justice in Education*. New York: Routledge. (Original work published 2009)
- Ball, A. (2000). Empowering pedagogies that enhance the learning of multicultural students. *Teachers College Record*, 102, 1006-1034.
- Banks, J.A. (1993). The canon debate, knowledge construction, and multicultural education. *Educational Researcher*, 22(6), 4-14.
- Banks, J. A., & McGee Banks, C. A. (2004). *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education* (2nd ed.). CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bell, D. A. (1980). *Brown v. Board of Education and the interest convergence dilemma*. 93 *Harvard Law Review* 518.
- Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life*. New York: Basic Books.
- Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children*. New York: The New Press.
- Delpit, L. (2002). No kinda sense. In L. Delpit & J. Dowdy (Eds.), *The skin that we speak: Thoughts on language and culture in the classroom* (pp. 31-48). New York: The New Press.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2005). *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dixson, A. D., & Rousseau, C. K. (2005, March). And We Are Still Not Saved: Critical Race Theory in Education Ten Years Later. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 8(1), 7-28.

- Finn, C. E., Jr. (1993). *We must take charge: Our schools and our future*. New York: The Free Press.
- Freire, P. (2001a). *Pedagogy of Freedom* (P. Clarke, Trans., Critical Perspectives Series.). New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc. (Original work published 1998)
- Freire, P. (2001b). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans., 30th Anniversary ed.). New York: Continuum. (Original work published 1970)
- Godley, A. J., & Minnici, A. (1998). Critical Language Pedagogy In An Urban High School English Class. *Urban Education*, 43(3), 319-346. doi:10.1177/0042085907311801
- Guba, E. G. (1990). *The Paradigm Dialog*. New York: SAGE.
- Hidalgo, N. M. (1994). Profile of a Puerto Rican family's support for school achievement. *Equity and Choice*, 10(2), 14-22.
- Hirsch, E. D., Kett, J. F., & Trefil, J. S. (1988). *Cultural literacy: What every American needs to know*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Kerlinger, F.N. (1979). *Behavioral research*. Austin, TX: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Kerssen-Griep, J., & Eifler, K. (2008). When Cross-Racial Contact Transforms Intercultural Communication Competence: White Novice Teachers Learn Alongside Their African American High School Mentees. *Journal of Transformative Education*, 6(4), 251-269. doi:10.1177/1541344608330125
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

- Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record*, 97(1), 47-68.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11(1), 7-24.
- Levstik, L. S., & Tyson, C. A. (2008). *Handbook of Research in Social Studies Education*. New York: Routledge.
- Lindlof, T. R., & Taylor, B. C. (2002) *Qualitative communication research methods: Second edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc
- Lipsey, M. W., & Wilson, D. B. (2001). *Practical Meta-Analysis*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Matsumoto, D. (1994). *Cultural influences on research methods and statistics*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- May, S. (Ed.) (1999). *Critical multiculturalism: Rethinking multicultural and antiracist education*. London: Falmer Press.
- Milroy, J. (2001). Language ideologies and the consequences of standardization. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 5(4), 530-555.
- Mizio, E. (1974). Impact of external systems on the Puerto Rican family. *Social Casework*, 55(2), 76-85.
- Nieto, S. (2000). *Affirming Diversity: The Sociopolitical Context of Multicultural Education* (3rd ed.). New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.
- Nieto, S. (2006). *Teaching as Political Work: Courageous and Caring Teachers*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED501197). Retrieved from ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center) database.

- Posner, G. J. (2004). *Analyzing The Curriculum* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.

(Original work published 1992)
- Salgado, R. (1985). The Puerto Rican family. In L. Nuñez (Ed.), *Puerto Ricans in the mid '80s: An American challenge* (pp. 29-44). Alexandria, VA: National Puerto Rican Coalition.
- Stovall, D. (March 30, 2009a), Personal communication [by email] with author.
- Stovall, D. (March 23, 2009b), Personal communication [by interview] with author.
- Swartz, E. (1992). Emancipatory narratives: Rewriting the master script in the school curriculum. *Journal of Negro Education*, 61, 341-355
- Tate, W. F. (1997). Critical Race Theory and Education: History, Theory, and Implications. In M. W. Apple (ed.), *Review of Research in Education*, vol. 22 (195-247). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Thomas, O., Davidson, W., & Mcadoo, H. (2008). An Evaluation Study of The Young Empowered Sisters (YES!) Program: Promoting Cultural Assets Among African American Adolescent Girls Through a Culturally Relevant School-Based Intervention. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 34(3), 281-308.
doi:10.1177/009579840831413
- Tompkins, Jane. "Pedagogy of the Distressed." *College English* 52 (1990): 653-660.
- Willis, P.E. (1977). *Learning to labour: How working classkids get working class jobs*. Farnborough, UK: Saxon House.
- Yosso, T. J. (2005, March). Whose Culture Has Capital? A Critical Race Theory Discussion of Community Cultural Wealth. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 8(1), 69-92.

Young, I. M. (1990). *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Appendix A

Hand-Calculations for Effect Size(s) (ES) for Cross-Racial Contact study⁶

Summed BASIC Score	
$t = \frac{(\bar{D})}{S_{\bar{D}}} \quad 5.50 = \frac{4.9}{S_{\bar{D}}} \quad 5.50S_{\bar{D}} = 4.9 \quad S_{\bar{D}} = \frac{4.9}{5.50} \quad S_{\bar{D}} = 0.890 \quad S_{\bar{D}} = \frac{S}{\sqrt{n}} \quad S_{\bar{D}} = \frac{S}{\sqrt{12}}$ $0.890 = \frac{S}{\sqrt{12}} \quad 0.890\sqrt{12} = S \quad 3.0862 = S \quad d = \frac{(\bar{D})}{S} \quad d = \frac{4.9}{3.0862} \quad d = 1.5877$	
1. Respond descriptively $t = \frac{(\bar{D})}{S_{\bar{D}}} \quad 7.99 = \frac{0.77}{S_{\bar{D}}} \quad 7.99S_{\bar{D}} = 0.77 \quad S_{\bar{D}} = \frac{0.77}{7.99} \quad S_{\bar{D}} = 0.096 \quad S_{\bar{D}} = \frac{S}{\sqrt{n}} \quad S_{\bar{D}} = \frac{S}{\sqrt{12}}$ $0.096 = \frac{S}{\sqrt{12}} \quad 0.096\sqrt{12} = S \quad 0.3338 = S \quad d = \frac{(\bar{D})}{S} \quad d = \frac{0.77}{0.3338} \quad d = 2.3065$	
2. Display empathy $t = \frac{(\bar{D})}{S_{\bar{D}}} \quad 6.08 = \frac{0.90}{S_{\bar{D}}} \quad 6.08S_{\bar{D}} = 0.90 \quad S_{\bar{D}} = \frac{0.90}{6.08} \quad S_{\bar{D}} = 0.148 \quad S_{\bar{D}} = \frac{S}{\sqrt{n}} \quad S_{\bar{D}} = \frac{S}{\sqrt{12}}$ $0.148 = \frac{S}{\sqrt{12}} \quad 0.148\sqrt{12} = S \quad 0.5127 = S \quad d = \frac{(\bar{D})}{S} \quad d = \frac{0.90}{0.5127} \quad d = 1.7551$	
3. Express respect and positive regard $t = \frac{(\bar{D})}{S_{\bar{D}}} \quad 4.77 = \frac{0.80}{S_{\bar{D}}} \quad 4.77S_{\bar{D}} = 0.80 \quad S_{\bar{D}} = \frac{0.80}{4.77} \quad S_{\bar{D}} = 0.167 \quad S_{\bar{D}} = \frac{S}{\sqrt{n}} \quad S_{\bar{D}} = \frac{S}{\sqrt{12}}$ $0.167 = \frac{S}{\sqrt{12}} \quad 0.167\sqrt{12} = S \quad 0.5809 = S \quad d = \frac{(\bar{D})}{S} \quad d = \frac{0.80}{0.5809} \quad d = 1.3769$	
4. Ambiguity tolerance $t = \frac{(\bar{D})}{S_{\bar{D}}} \quad 3.54 = \frac{0.64}{S_{\bar{D}}} \quad 3.54S_{\bar{D}} = 0.64 \quad S_{\bar{D}} = \frac{0.64}{3.54} \quad S_{\bar{D}} = 0.180 \quad S_{\bar{D}} = \frac{S}{\sqrt{n}} \quad S_{\bar{D}} = \frac{S}{\sqrt{12}}$ $0.180 = \frac{S}{\sqrt{12}} \quad 0.180\sqrt{12} = S \quad 0.6262 = S \quad d = \frac{(\bar{D})}{S} \quad d = \frac{0.64}{0.6262} \quad d = 1.0219$	

⁶ This study was a repeated-measures study

5. Interaction management

$$t = \frac{(\bar{D})}{S_{\bar{D}}} \quad 2.97 = \frac{0.60}{S_{\bar{D}}} \quad 2.97S_{\bar{D}} = 0.60 \quad S_{\bar{D}} = \frac{0.60}{2.97} \quad S_{\bar{D}} = 0.202 \quad S_{\bar{D}} = \frac{S}{\sqrt{n}} \quad S_{\bar{D}} = \frac{S}{\sqrt{12}}$$

$$0.202 = \frac{S}{\sqrt{12}} \quad 0.202\sqrt{12} = S \quad 0.6998 = S \quad d = \frac{(\bar{D})}{S} \quad d = \frac{0.60}{0.6998} \quad d = 0.8573$$

6. Group maintenance behaviors

$$t = \frac{(\bar{D})}{S_{\bar{D}}} \quad 1.93 = \frac{0.47}{S_{\bar{D}}} \quad 1.93S_{\bar{D}} = 0.47 \quad S_{\bar{D}} = \frac{0.47}{1.93} \quad S_{\bar{D}} = 0.243 \quad S_{\bar{D}} = \frac{S}{\sqrt{n}} \quad S_{\bar{D}} = \frac{S}{\sqrt{12}}$$

$$0.243 = \frac{S}{\sqrt{12}} \quad 0.243\sqrt{12} = S \quad 0.8435 = S \quad d = \frac{(\bar{D})}{S} \quad d = \frac{0.47}{0.8435} \quad d = 0.5571$$

7. Group task role behaviors

$$t = \frac{(\bar{D})}{S_{\bar{D}}} \quad 1.75 = \frac{0.43}{S_{\bar{D}}} \quad 1.75S_{\bar{D}} = 0.43 \quad S_{\bar{D}} = \frac{0.43}{1.75} \quad S_{\bar{D}} = 0.245 \quad S_{\bar{D}} = \frac{S}{\sqrt{n}} \quad S_{\bar{D}} = \frac{S}{\sqrt{12}}$$

$$0.245 = \frac{S}{\sqrt{12}} \quad 0.245\sqrt{12} = S \quad 0.8511 = S \quad d = \frac{(\bar{D})}{S} \quad d = \frac{0.43}{0.8511} \quad d = 0.5051$$

8. Personal knowledge orientation

$$t = \frac{(\bar{D})}{S_{\bar{D}}} \quad 1.66 = \frac{0.30}{S_{\bar{D}}} \quad 1.66S_{\bar{D}} = 0.30 \quad S_{\bar{D}} = \frac{0.30}{1.66} \quad S_{\bar{D}} = 0.180 \quad S_{\bar{D}} = \frac{S}{\sqrt{n}} \quad S_{\bar{D}} = \frac{S}{\sqrt{12}}$$

$$0.180 = \frac{S}{\sqrt{12}} \quad 0.180\sqrt{12} = S \quad 0.6260 = S \quad d = \frac{(\bar{D})}{S} \quad d = \frac{0.30}{0.6260} \quad d = 0.4792$$

Appendix B

Interpretation of Cohen's d

Cohen's Standard	Effect Size
	2.0
	1.9
	1.8
	1.7
	1.6
	1.5
	1.4
	1.3
	1.2
	1.1
	1.0
	0.9
LARGE	0.8
	0.7
	0.6
MEDIUM	0.5
	0.4
	0.3
SMALL	0.2
	0.1
	0.0

Appendix C

Three Selected (High School) Social Justice Curricula/Programs

<i>Types of Social Justice Curricula/Programs</i>	
Type	Description
Antiracism (2 studies)	<p>In these two studies, teachers focused much attention on antiracist education practices.</p> <p><i>Evaluation Study (YES! Program)</i></p> <p>A Cohen's d was unable to be derived as the authors did not present the summary data necessary to calculate an ES for the ANCOVA tests incorporated.</p> <p><i>Cross-Racial Contact (Bridge Builders Academic Mentoring Program (BAMP))</i></p> <p>Cohen's $d = 1.5877$</p>
Other (1 study)	<p>In this one study, teachers focused on language and the ability to code-switch.</p> <p><i>Critical Language Pedagogy</i></p> <p>A Cohen's d was unable to be derived because the pre- and post-questionnaires relied upon qualitative, not quantitative, data.</p> <p>However, Godley and Minnici (1998) reported the following:</p> <p>[...] student questionnaires indicated that the implementation of critical language pedagogy in our language variation unit led students to more positive, detailed, and reflective understandings of their own dialect use that were maintained over time.</p> <p>Students' written reflections on the unit also suggested that they had learned to question widespread language ideologies, particularly the assumption that some dialects are better than others. For example, in response to the question, "What was the most interesting or useful idea or skill you learned during our unit?" one student wrote, "There's really no correct English; every English dialect is all English." Another student wrote, "People do a lot of stereotyping." (p. 338)</p>